

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/986,411	11/08/2001	Naoto Iwakiri	Q67065	5218
7590 05/05/2004			EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN, MACPEAK & SEAS			GAGLIARDI, ALBERT J	
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3212			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2878	

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	uha /			
Applicant(s)				
IWAKIRI, NAOTO				
Art Unit				
2878				
orr spondence add	ress			
R ALLOWANCE. ation. A proper reply to a ch places the application in ely filed Request for Continued				
final rejection, whichever is later. In no the final rejection. FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 36(a) and the appropriate extension fee fee. The appropriate extension fee under				
he final Office action; or ction, even if timely filed, eriod set forth in if the appeal.	(2) as set forth in may reduce any			
see NOTE below);				
erially reducing or	simplifying the			
înally rejected clai <u>n/search</u> .	ms.			
ted in a separate, t	imely filed			
en considered but o <u>Sheef</u> . to issues which we				
)☐ will be entered ow or appended.	and an			

Advisory Action	09

IWAKIRI, NA 9/986,411 Art Unit Examiner 2878 Albert J. Gagliardi

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover she twith the correspondent

Application No.

THE REPLY FILED FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWAN Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A profinal rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the

condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a	a) or b)]
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.	to not forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In DO
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MO 706.07(f).	e mailing date of the final rejection. ONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition ur have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the correspondin 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ng amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid	d within the period set forth in dismissal of the appeal.
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:	
(a) Methey raise new issues that would require further consideration and	d/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for ap issues for appeal; and/or	opeal by materially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding	number of finally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>The limitations relating to a releasing mechanism require furthers.</u> 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	er consideration/search .
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) <u>20,21,24 and 27</u> would be allowa amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ble if submitted in a separate, timely filed
 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsiders place the application in condition for allowance because: See 6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not direct raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	Continuation Sheet.
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is p	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	
Claim(s) allowed:	
Claim(s) objected to: 20,21,24 and 27.	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19,22,23,25,26 and 28-38</u> .	
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disa	approved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) P	aper No(s)
10. Other:	
	Albert J. Gagliardi Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2878

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments are generally unconvincing or spurious and, in some cases, amount to mere allegations of patentability without such allegations being directed to specific limitations and/or claimed limitations. Additionally, applicant's arguments relating to per se obviousness rejections are unclear because the examiner is unaware of any per se rejections. The examiner notes that while the examiner has considered some limitation to be non-critical design choices, some of which may be predicated on legal precedent, applicant has not met his burden of demonstrating any criticality relating to the limitations (see MPEP 2144 and 2144.04). In addition, applicant's request for evidence to support some of those limitations considered as well known is not considered as an adequate traversal of such facts because applicant has not pointed out why the noticed facts are not considered to be common knowledge in the art. As such the limitations are taken to be admitted prior art (see MPEP 2144.03 C). Additionally, the examiner notes that even if the request for evidence relating to power supplies (i.e., batteries) were considered as an adequate traversal, which it is not, the specific evidence of the known use of flexible lithium ion batteries in electronic devices has been previously provided in the Hikmet reference.